

EX PARTE CRIMATE FILED

6/10-924-2

From: "Joseph D'Alessandro" <jdman@magpage.com>
To: A7.A7(SFOX)
Date: 7/30/98 8:33pm
Subject: ?

DEAR FCC AND MY ELECTED OFFICIALS;;'

I HOLD YOU IN MY OWN OPINION, FOR THE DISCRIMINATION, AND RACISMS, AGAINST
MYSELF, OLGA, WOMAN, BLACKS AND OTHER MINORITY'S.; FOR THE PAST 55 YEARS
YOU HAVE TAKEN THE SUPREME COURT RULING
AND USED IT
AGAINST, WOMAN, BLACKS, AND MINORITY'S, FOR THE PAST 55 YEARS TO KEEP US OUT OF
OWNING A RADIO STATION ETC.;

READ SUPREME RULING

In National Broadcasting Co. v. United States, 319 U.S. 190 (1943), the
Supreme Court stated, in pertinent part, as follows (footnotes omitted):

We come, finally, to an appeal to the First Amendment. The Regulations, even if valid in all other respects, must fall because they abridge, say the appellants, their right of free speech. If that be so, it would follow that every person whose application for a license to operate a station is denied by the Commission is thereby denied his constitutional right of free speech. Freedom of utterance is abridged to many who wish to use the limited facilities of radio. Unlike other modes of expression, radio inherently is not available to all. That is its unique characteristic, and that is why, unlike other modes of expression, it is subject to government regulation. Because it cannot be used by all, some who wish to use it must be denied. . . . The right of free speech does not include, however, the right to use the facilities of radio without license. The licensing system established by Congress in the Communications Act was a proper exercise of its power over commerce. The standard it provided for licensing of stations was the 'public interest, convenience, and necessity.' Denial of a station license on that ground, if valid under the Act, is not a denial of free speech.

*****BROADCAST FREQUENCY'S LACK NO
LIMITS*****

THE SUPREME COURT, IN THERE DECISION DOES NOT MAKE A, DISTINCTION,; IF YOU
ARE DEAD OR ALIVE

RICH

IF YOU ARE POOR OR

BLACK OR WHITE

IF YOU ARE

NON-DISTINCTIONS

IF YOU ARE DISABLED
AND MANY OTHER

ALSO THERE RULING

DOES NOT GIVE, A NUMBER TO INCLUDE
OR EXCLUDE, HOW MANY, IT STATES "SOME" A CERTAIN UNSPECIFIED
QUANTITY, NUMBER, AND OR NOT KNOWN.;;

YOU THE FCC HAVE TAKEN THERE

RULEING AND MADE IT A FALSE AND OR
DERISIVE IMITATION,;;.

YOU HAVE USE THE SUPREME COURT

RULEING TO SURPRESS, THE LESS
FORTUNATE, AND ADVOCATE, SUUPORT, BIG BUSINESS, RADIO CONGLOMERATES, INVESTMENT
FIRMS, AND THE NAB;;.

MOM AND POP NEVER HAD A

CHANCE, ITS ALL ABOUT MONEY, AND OUR ELECTED
OFFICALS.;

Well me Mr.D'Alessandro, will struggle aganist you for MOM
and POP.

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

8/11-9247

From: "Joseph D'Alessandro" <jdman@magpage.com>
To: A7.A7(MMOYD)
Date: 7/30/98 8:41pm
Subject: ?

JUL 31 1998

DEAR FCC AND MY ELECTED OFFICIALS;;'

I HOLD YOU IN MY OWN OPINION, FOR THE DISCRIMINATION, AND RACISMS, AGAINST
MYSELF, OLGA, WOMAN, BLACKS AND OTHER MINORITY'S.; FOR THE PAST 55 YEARS
YOU HAVE TAKEN THE SUPREME COURT RULING
AND USED IT
AGAINST, WOMAN, BLACKS, AND MINORITY'S, FOR THE PAST 55 YEARS TO KEEP US OUT OF
OWNING A RADIO STATION ETC.;

READ SUPREME RULING

In National Broadcasting Co. v. United States, 319 U.S. 190 (1943), the
Supreme Court stated, in pertinent part, as follows (footnotes omitted):

We come, finally, to an appeal to the First Amendment. The Regulations, even if valid in all other respects, must fall because they abridge, say the appellants, their right of free speech. If that be so, it would follow that every person whose application for a license to operate a station is denied by the Commission is thereby denied his constitutional right of free speech. Freedom of utterance is abridged to many who wish to use the limited facilities of radio. Unlike other modes of expression, radio inherently is not available to all. That is its unique characteristic, and that is why, unlike other modes of expression, it is subject to government regulation. Because it cannot be used by all, some who wish to use it must be denied. . . . The right of free speech does not include, however, the right to use the facilities of radio without license. The licensing system established by Congress in the Communications Act was a proper exercise of its power over commerce. The standard it provided for licensing of stations was the 'public interest, convenience, and necessity.' Denial of a station license on that ground, if valid under the Act, is not a denial of free speech.

*****BROADCAST FREQUENCY'S LACK NO
LIMITS*****

THE SUPREME COURT, IN THERE DECISION DOES NOT MAKE A, DISTINCTION,; IF YOU
ARE DEAD OR ALIVE

RICH

IF YOU ARE POOR OR

BLACK OR WHITE

IF YOU ARE

NON-DISTINCTIONS

IF YOU ARE DISABLED
AND MANY OTHER

ALSO THERE RULING

DOES NOT GIVE,A NUMBER TO INCLUDE
OR EXCLUDE,HOW MANY,IT STATES""""SOME""""A CERTAIN UNSPECIFIED
QUANTITY,NUMBER,AND OR NOT KNOWN.;;

YOU THE FCC HAVE TAKEN THERE

RULEING AND MADE IT A FALSE AND OR
DERISIVE IMITATION,;;.

YOU HAVE USE THE SUPREME COURT

RULEING TO SURPRESS,THE LESS
FORTUNATE,AND ADVOCATE,SUUPPORT,BIG BUSINESS,RADIO CONGLOMERATES,INVESTMENT
FIRMS,AND THE NAB;;.'

MOM AND POP NEVER HAD A

CHANCE,ITS ALL ABOUT MONEY,AND OUR ELECTED
OFFICALS.;

Well me Mr.D'Alessandro,will struggle aganist you for MOM
and POP.

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

4242

From: "Joseph D'Alessandro" <jdman@magpage.com>
To: A7.A7(TPOWER)
Date: 7/30/98 8:34pm
Subject: ?

JUL 31 1998

DEAR FCC AND MY ELECTED OFFICIALS;'

I HOLD YOU IN MY OWN OPINION, FOR THE DISCRIMINATION, AND RACISMS, AGAINST
MYSELF, OLGA, WOMAN, BLACKS AND OTHER MINORITY'S.; FOR THE PAST 55 YEARS
YOU HAVE TAKEN THE SUPREME COURT RULEING
AND USED IT
AGAINST, WOMAN, BLACKS, AND MINORITY'S, FOR THE PAST 55 YEARS TO KEEP US OUT OF
OWNING A RADIO STATION ETC.;

READ SUPREME RULEING

In National Broadcasting Co. v. United States, 319 U.S. 190 (1943), the
Supreme Court stated, in pertinent part, as follows (footnotes omitted):

We come, finally, to an appeal to the First Amendment. The Regulations, even if valid in all other respects, must fall because they abridge, say the appellants, their right of free speech. If that be so, it would follow that every person whose application for a license to operate a station is denied by the Commission is thereby denied his constitutional right of free speech. Freedom of utterance is abridged to many who wish to use the limited facilities of radio. Unlike other modes of expression, radio inherently is not available to all. That is its unique characteristic, and that is why, unlike other modes of expression, it is subject to government regulation. Because it cannot be used by all, some who wish to use it must be denied. . . . The right of free speech does not include, however, the right to use the facilities of radio without license. The licensing system established by Congress in the Communications Act was a proper exercise of its power over commerce. The standard it provided for licensing of stations was the 'public interest, convenience, and necessity.' Denial of a station license on that ground, if valid under the Act, is not a denial of free speech.

*****BROADCAST FREQUENCY'S LACK NO
LIMITS*****

THE SUPREME COURT, IN THERE DECISION DOES NOT MAKE A, DISTINCTION,; IF YOU
ARE DEAD OR ALIVE

RICH

IF YOU ARE POOR OR

BLACK OR WHITE

IF YOU ARE

NON-DISTINCTIONS

IF YOU ARE DISABLED
AND MANY OTHER

ALSO THERE RULEING

DOES NOT GIVE, A NUMBER TO INCLUDE
OR EXCLUDE, HOW MANY, IT STATES "SOME" A CERTAIN UNSPECIFIED
QUANTITY, NUMBER, AND OR NOT KNOWN.;;

YOU THE FCC HAVE TAKEN THERE

RULEING AND MADE IT A FALSE AND OR
DERISIVE IMITATION,;;.

YOU HAVE USE THE SUPREME COURT

RULEING TO SURPRESS, THE LESS
FORTUNATE, AND ADVOCATE, SUUPORT, BIG BUSINESS, RADIO CONGLOMERATES, INVESTMENT
FIRMS, AND THE NAB;;.

MOM AND POP NEVER HAD A

CHANCE, ITS ALL ABOUT MONEY, AND OUR ELECTED
OFFICALS.;

Well me Mr.D'Alessandro, will struggle aganist you for MOM
and POP.